UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/712,771 | 11/12/2003 | Yuval Gilboa | 017900-003810US | 7406 |

59734 7590 11/20/2007

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| DASGUPTA, SOUMYA | |
| **ART UNIT** | **PAPER NUMBER** |
| 2176 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 11/20/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/712,771 | GILBOA, YUVAL | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Soumya Dasgupta | 2176 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/21/07.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 11,17,19,20,25 and 29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,9,10,12,13,15,21-24,26,28 and 30 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

This is the final action based on applicant's response filed on 9/21/07 with respect to 10/712, 771 application filed on 11/12/2003. Claims 1-10, 12-16, 18, 21-24, 26-28, and 30 are currently pending and being considered below. Claims 1, 9-10, 24, 28, and 30 are independent claims.

### *Applicant's Response*

In the applicant's response dated 9/21/07, the applicant amended claims 1-2, 4, 9-10, 12-13, 15, 21-24, 26, 28 & 30. The applicant cancelled claims 11, 17, 19-20, 25, & 29. The applicant argued against all rejections.

The rejection under 35 USC ~ 112 (2nd paragraph), set forth for claims 1-4, 8-25, & 27-30 are withdrawn because the applicant defined their definitions as how it is used in the art.

Currently, claims 1-10, 12-16, 18, 21-24, 26-28, and 30 are pending and are subject to examination.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-15, 18, 21-22, 28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Microsoft Access 2000 (for hereon will be known as Access).

Claim 1:

Access teaches a method for generating a user interface, the user interface being configured for use in a client-server environment (pg 242 for networks), the method comprising: providing an editor for designing a visual representation of a user interface, the editor providing a workspace and a task panel to be displayed on a display device on a client system, the workspace being provided to design the visual representation thereon, the task panel providing a plurality of elements for use in designing the visual representation, one or more of the elements being associated with a server system remotely located from the client system (pg 242 for networks; the examiner notes that Access is a GUI editor); selecting a first actor from the task panel, the first actor being a data source object that is one of the elements and includes application logic needed to access application layer provided in the server system ; inserting the first actor into the workspace (pg 224-230 shows inserting an operator into a workspace by using a toolbar); inserting a second actor selected from the task panel into the workspace (pg 224-230 shows inserting an operator into a workspace by using a toolbar);

diagrammatically defining a behavioral relationship between the first actor and the second actor (pg 165 → Access discloses the "relationship between the first and second actor" in that the relationship toolbars a line showing the relationship between the variables. Access discloses "behavioral relationship" in that script of the Visual Basic is written as the variables and the interface are being manipulated to generate the GUI. The examiner notes that it is well known in the art for GUI builders to generate source code before the program completion or compilation.)

and generating executable code from the first and second actors and the behavioral relationship thereof. (pg 21-43 for Visual Basic code) The examiner notes that it is well known in the art that Visual Basic is a form of source code that can be can be compiled into executable code, like any other source code.

- Access discloses "behavioral relationship" in that script of the Visual Basic is written as the variables and the interface are being manipulated to generate the GUI. The examiner notes that it is well known in the art for GUI builders to generate source code before the program completion or compilation.

- See Larry Ayers article on how source code can be complied into an executable code (http://www.linuxjournal.com/article/0216).

Claim 2:

Access teaches a generating a canonic representation of the first and second actor and the behavioral relationship thereof, wherein the executable code is generated from the canonic representation. (pg 21-43 for Visual Basic code) The examiner notes that it is inherent that Visual Basic is a form of source code that can be can be compiled into executable code, like any other source code. See Larry Ayers article on how source code can be complied into an executable code (http://www.linuxjournal.com/article/0216).

Claim 3:

Access teaches a method wherein the generated executable code is compatible with a first platform, wherein the canonic representation is used to generate executable code for a second platform. (pg 21-43 for Visual Basic code) The examiner notes that it is inherent that Visual Basic is a form of source code that can be can be compiled into executable code, like any other source code. See Larry Ayers article on how source code can be complied into an executable code (http://www.linuxjournal.com/article/0216).

Claim 4:

Access teaches a method comprising: inserting an operator to the workspace, the operator being configured to process data in a specific way (pg 224-230 shows inserting an operator into a workspace by using a toolbar); diagrammatically defining a behavior al behavioral relationship between the second actor and the operator (pg 165 – behavioral relationship tool bar).

Claim 5:

Access teaches a method comprising: storing an identifier of the first actor in a work session associated with the current instance of the editor, wherein the identifier of the first actor is used to call the first actor stored in the server system during a runtime to have the first actor perform a predetermined task (pg 21-43 for Visual Basic source codes and pg 207 for operator function call). The examiner interprets this process a simple operator function call.

Claim 6:

Access teaches a method comprising: logging on to the server system to launch the editor (pg 242). The examiner interprets "server system" to be a network system. Access allows a user to login to a network in order to gain admittance to use the MS Access from a client server.

Claim 7:

Access teaches storing the generated executable code to a repository in the server system. (pg 242 for network system and pg 19, 31, and 37 on storing)

Claim 9:

A method for generating a user interface using a modeling system, comprising: providing an editor for designing a visual representation of a user interface from a server system to a client system, the editor providing a workspace and a task panel to be displayed on a display device on the client system, the workspace being provided to design the visual representation thereon, the task panel providing a plurality of elements for use in designing the visual representation, one or more of the elements being associated with the server system remotely located from the client system (pg 242 for networks; the examiner notes that Access is a GUI editor); displaying a scenario selected by a user on the workspace, the scenario being compatible with user requirements for the user interface, the scenario including a plurality of interleaved scenes (p. 327 - 333 for creating web pages for applications. The examiner interprets a web page is a type of scenario); defining each of the plurality of scenes according to inputs received from the user, each scene including concurrently active and collaborating actors, the actors being specialized computational units that represent threads of activities, where each scene is defined by diagrammatically defining a behavioral relationship between the actors associated with that scene (pg 165 for diagrammatic behavioral relationship tool bar); generating a canonic representation of a model represented by the scenario and the scenes (pg 21-43 for Visual Basic source codes); and generating first and second executable of from the canonic representation, wherein the first code is compatible with a first platform and the
second code is compatible with a second platform that is different from the first

platform. (pg 21-43 for Visual Basic source codes). The examiner notes that it is inherent that Visual Basic is a form of source code that can be can be compiled into executable code, like any other source code.

- The examiner also notes that the first and second executables are first and second compilations of code that occur in two different platforms, the platform being possible operating systems.
- See Larry Ayers article on how source code can be complied into an executable code (http://www.linuxjournal.com/article/0216).

Claim 10:

Access teaches a method for generating a user interface in a distributed computer system a plurality of computers coupled in a network, the method comprising: displaying a first business function component selected by a first user on a first display area of a front-end system, the first business function component being associated with first application logic to access a first business application provided in a server system (pg 242 for networks); displaying a second business function component selected by the first user on the first display area of the client system, the second business function component being associated with second application logic to access a second business application provided in the server system;

forming a behavioral relationship between the first and second business function components, wherein creating a visual representation of the user interface is created based on the displaying steps and the forming step;

generating a canonic representation of the visual representation; (pg 21-43 for Visual Basic source codes)

and generating a first and second executable user interface code from the canonic representation, the first and second executable user interface code being operable to access the first and second applications provided in the server system to retrieve desired data,

wherein the first code is compatible with a first platform and the second code is compatible with a second platform that is different from the first platform. (pg 242 for client systems and networks; pg 165 relationships for business functions; p. 207 for operator function call.) The examiner interprets business functions as object oriented function calls for business applications.

Claim 12:

Access teaches a method of storing the user interface code in a repository in the server system, wherein the first and second business applications are different applications. (pg 242 for network system and pg 19, 31, and 37 on storing)

Claim 13:

Access teaches a method wherein the visual representation includes a third business function component that specifies a presentation format, the method further comprising: storing the user interface code in a repository associated with the server system (pg 242 for network system and pg 19, 31, and 37 on storing); and receiving a request to access the user interface code from a second user, wherein the user interface code is executed in response to the request, the code being used to access the first and second applications provided in the server

system to retrieve data desired by the second user, wherein the data retrieved for the second user is displayed on a second display area of the client system according to presentation format specified by the third business function component, the first and second display areas being associated with different client systems(pg 242 for network system and pg 21-43 for Visual Basic code). The examiner notes and sending and receiving requests to and from server and clients is an inherent property of network systems. The code can be written in a plurality of languages, including Visual Basic and XML.

Claim 14:

Access teaches a method of storing a first identifier for the first business function component in the client system in conjunction with the displaying-a-first-business-function-component step (pg 242 for network system and pg 19, 31, and 37 on storing); and storing a second identifier for the second business function component in the client system in conjunction with the displaying-a-second-business-function-component step, wherein the first and second identifiers are used subsequently at a runtime to access the first and second application logics, respectively (pg 242 for network system and pg 19, 31, and 37 on storing).

Claim 15:

The method of claim 14, wherein the first and second identifiers are inserted in the canonic representation. (pg 21-43 for Visual Basic Code). The examiner notes that it is inherent that Visual Basic is a form of source code that can be can be compiled into executable code, like any other source code. See Larry Ayers article on how source code can be complied into an executable code (http://www.linuxjournal.com/article/0216).

Claim 18:

Access teaches a method for associating an operator to the second business function component; and connecting an output port of the second business function component to an input port of the operator (pg 165 – behavioral relationship tool bar)

Claim 21:

Access teaches a method of claim 18, wherein the operator processes data received from the second business function component in such a way that the data remain consistent with the second application logic associated with the second business function component. (pg 165 – behavioral relationship tool bar); The examiner notes that business functions are interpreted as object oriented function calls for business applications.

Claim 22:

Access teaches a method wherein the first and second business function components are selected form a predefined set of business function components. (pg 163–192 for creating an application and pg 314-327 for hyperlinks that can be used to run any program) The examiner interprets that a reusable application is any computer application. The examiner notes that business functions are interpreted as object oriented function calls for business applications.

Claim 28:

Claim 28 corresponds to claim 10.

Claim 30:

Claim 30 corresponds to claim 10.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Access in view of Fitzloff et al ("Web Open Enterprise Portals" by Emily Fitzloff and Dana Gardner; from hereon will be known as Fitz').

Claim 8:

- Access teaches one or more servers dedicated to the application layer and one or more Web servers dedicated to interface with a plurality of client systems (pg 242 for networks).
- Access fails to teach an enterprise portal.
- Fitz' teaches an enterprise portal (pg. 2, http://www.infoworld.com/cgi-bin/displayStory.pl?/features/990125eip.htm).
- Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify Access and its GUI builder to include enterprise portals as taught by Fitz' because it allows GUI use in business applications.

- Both Access and Fitz' teach GUI's and web applications.

6. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Access in view of Burkett et al (US 6476828; from hereon will be known as Burkett).

Claim 16:

- Access teaches a canonic representation (Visual Basic)... wherein the first and second applications may be the same application or different applications. (pg 21-43)
- Access does not teach XML.
- Burkett teaches a canonic representation in XML. (Fig 3 A, B and Fig 4 A, B)
- Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify Access to use XML as a GUI builder as taught by Burkett because it allows the user to build a GUI in multiple languages including XML and Visual Basic. XML is inherently a robust language that can be used for multiple applications. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Xml)
- Both Access and Burkett teach canonical representations and source code.

8. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Access in view of Ching et al (US 6407761; from hereon will be known as Ching') and in further view of Babutzka et al (US 6898794; from hereon will be known as Bab').

Claim 23:

- Access teaches predefined set of business function components. (pg 314-327 for hyperlinks that can be used to run any program). The examiner interprets that a reusable application is any computer application.
- Access fails to teach a business application program interface (BAPI) and a remote function call (RFC).
- Ching include a business application program interface (BAPI). (Fig 5 which describes the parameters of the BAPI interface)
- Both Access and Ching fail to teach RFC's.
- Bab' teaches a RFC (The examiner notes that in the abstract the inventor Bab'8 improves "remote function calls").
- Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify Access to include BAPI's and RFC's as taught by Ching and Bab' respectively because it allows GUI applications to be used with business applications in a remote network environment. The examiner notes that it is inherent that RFC's are used in ABAP or advanced business applications. Since a BAPI is a business application interface (or an user interface for a plurality of business applications), ABAP (or advanced business

applications programming) languages can be used in BAPI's. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ABAP, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Remote_function_call).

- Access, Ching, and Bab' teach applications that can be run on GUI's.

9. Claims 24 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Access in view of Lennartsson et al (US 5446846; from hereon will be known as Len').

Claims 24 and 26-27:

- Access teaches a means for displaying a first business function component selected by a first user on a first display area of a client system, the first business function component being associated with first application logic to access a first business application provided in a server system (pg 242 for network system and pg 207 for business functions; The examiner notes that network systems are synonymous with server and client systems and business functions are interpreted as object oriented function calls for business applications. Also, the examiner interprets distributed computer system as a network system.); means for displaying a second business function component selected by the first user on the first display area of the client system, the second business function component being associated with second application logic to access a second business application provided in the server system (pg 242 for network system

and pg 207 for business functions; The examiner notes that network systems are synonymous with server and client systems and business functions are interpreted as object oriented function calls for business applications); and means for forming a relationship between the first and second business function components, wherein a visual representation of the user interface is created based on the displaying steps and the forming step (pg 165 – relationship tool bar). The examiner notes that business functions are interpreted as object oriented function calls for business applications.

- Access also teaches the limitations of claim 26; with respect to the claim, Access teaches a system of further comprising: means for storing the user interface code in a repository in the server system. (pg 242 for network system and pg 19, 31, and 37 on storing)
- Access also teaches the limitations of claim 27; with respect to the claim, Access teaches a visual representation includes a third business function component that specifies a presentation format, the system further comprising: means for storing the user interface code in a repository associated with the server system (pg 242 for network system, pg 19, 31, and 37 on storing and pg 319 for a webpage or visual representation with function buttons); and means for receiving a request to access the user interface code from a second user, wherein the user interface code is executed in response to the request, the code being used to access the first and second applications provided in the server system to retrieve data

desired by the second user, wherein the data retrieved for the second user is displayed on a second display area of the client system according to presentation format specified by the third business function component, the first and second display areas being associated with different client systems. (Pg 21-43 for Visual Basic code and PG 242 for network system) The examiner notes and sending and receiving requests to and from server and clients is an inherent property of network systems. The examiner also notes that code written in any robust language can program this, including Visual Basic and XML.

- With regard to claim 24, Access does not teach a distributed computer system.
- Len' teaches a distributed computer system "arrangement with master units and slave units which communicate with one another via a serial bus connection and in which the slave units can be connected to the connection via connecting devices and on their respective connection can be assigned identifications in the system." (col 1, lines 5-11)

- Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify Access to into a distributed computing system as taught by Len' because it allows GUI applications to be performed in a non-centralized networking environment.
- Both Access and Len' teach networks.

***Response to Arguments***

**Claim Rejections under 35 USC ~ 102 (b) (Claims 1-8, 9-19 , 21-22 and 28-30):**

4. Applicant's arguments filed for claims 1-8, 9-19, 21-22 and 28-30 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. (i)The applicant states that Access teaches a GUI generation and source code development for a single platform, and not multiple platform platforms. Also, the Access teaches a GUI generation and source code development for the same platform, and not different platforms. (ii) The applicant also argues that Access does not teach a first and second executable user interface code from canonic representation. (iii) The applicant also argues that Access does not teach behavioral relationships, and the relationship is not inserted from a taskbar, but of data and tables. (iv) The applicant also states that Access does not teach business function components.

The examiner disagrees.

(i) Multiple platforms can be interpreted to mean multiple computers having the same the Operating System (OS). In other words, if two or more computers have the same operating system, then there are multiple platforms of the same OS. It is also well known in the art that MS Access performs on different platforms, such Windows and Mac.

(ii) The examiner notes that the Visual Basic source code stays the same while being compiled on different operating systems, thus producing different executable codes.

(iii) Access, on pg 165, also teaches a diagram of the behavioral relationship between the two variables because the Visual Basic code is being generated as the variable and the interface are being manipulated; the source code is generated without compilation or without the completion of the program. The examiner notes that the applicant argues, but does not claim that the visual relationship is shown without a task.

(iv) The applicant states on pg 13 of the argument that on pg 11, lines 24-26 of the specification, the term "business functions" are defined. The applicant defines business functions as a basic building block for creating a visual representation of a user interface. The examiner notes that Access, using variable and objects, create Graphical User Interfaces and their respective source code for user implementation. Access can use both source codes and visual objects (that also generates source code) to build a GUI.

**Claim Rejections under 35 USC ~ 103 (a) (Claims 8, 16, 20, 23, and 24-27):**

5. Applicant's arguments filed for claims 8, 16, 20, 23, and 24-27 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant gives similar arguments to that of "Claim Rejections under 35 USC ~ 102 (b) (Claims 1-8, 9-19, 21-22 and 28-30)" in the

"Response to Arguments" above, and is contradicted by the examiner also stated above.

***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Soumya Dasgupta whose telephone number is 571-272-7432. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9am-7pm, F 9am-1pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SD

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100